

Remarks

Claims 1 to 33 and 41 were previously cancelled. Claims 34 to 40 and 42 to 46 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection of claims over U.S. Patent No. 6,087,112

The Examiner rejected claims 34 to 36, 40, 42, and 44 to 46 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 to 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,087,112. See Action at pages 2 to 3. Solely to expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, applicant encloses a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,087,112 and the required fee of \$110.00. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Rejection of claims over U.S. Patent No. 6,440,723

The Examiner rejected claims 34 to 36, 40, 42, and 44 to 46 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 to 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,440,723. See Action at page 3. Solely to expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, applicant encloses a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,440,723 and the required fee of \$110.00. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Rejection of claims over U.S. Patent No. 6,562,569

The Examiner rejected claims 34 to 36, 38 to 40 and 43 to 46 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 to 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,562,569. See Action at page 3. Solely to expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, applicant encloses a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. Patent

No. 6,562,569 and the required fee of \$110.00. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Objection to claim 37

The Examiner objects to claim 37 as being dependent from a rejected claim. See Action at page 3. Claim 37 depends from independent claim 34. Because applicant has filed three terminal disclaimers with this response to obviate the three double-patenting rejections of claim 34, claim 37 should now depend from an allowable claim. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's objection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance and requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner does not consider the application to be in condition for allowance, applicant requests that she call the undersigned at (650) 849-6658 to set up an interview.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 20, 2004

By: 
Michael R. Albrecht
Reg. No. 54,956
Customer No. 22,852